

# APPROVED MEETING MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
CITY OF ALAMEDA PLANNING BOARD  
MONDAY, APRIL 26, 2010

1. CONVENE: 7:10 p.m.
2. FLAG SALUTE: Board member Cook
3. ROLL CALL: Present: President Ezzy Ashcraft, Vice-President Autorino, Board members Cook, Kohlstrand and Zuppan.

Absent: Board member Cunningham and Lynch

4. MINUTES: Minutes from the meeting of March 22, 2010

Board member Cook motioned to approve minutes, seconded by Vice-President Autorino. **Approved 4-0 (Zuppan abstained)**

5. AGENDA CHANGES AND DISCUSSION:

None.

6. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

## Written Report

### **6-A** Future Agendas

Staff presented an overview of future Planning Board hearings.

### **6-B** Zoning Administrator Report

Staff reported approval of a use permit for a day spa at 2433 Central Avenue

## Oral Report

None.

7. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

None.

8. CONSENT CALENDAR:

None.

9. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS:

- 9-A Public Hearing to Provide Comments on the Boatworks Project Draft Environmental Impact Report and Project Alternatives. The project site is located at 2229 Clement Street.

Staff presented the project and project alternatives included in the Draft Environmental Impact Report.

President Ezzy Ashcraft opened the public comment period.

Ms. Field, resident, discussed her letter submitted to the Board and expressed concern with density, obstruction of views, increased traffic in the neighborhoods, and conflicts with trucks delivering to existing businesses in the area. She added she was speaking on behalf of residents of Elm Street.

Ms. Freeman, Estuary Park Action Committee representative, spoke in favor of the proposed 10 acre park as shown in the 1991 General Plan diagram. She voiced concern with contamination levels on the assembled properties, the parking and traffic impacts, as well as the cumulative impacts from all future development in the area. She also stated that the proposed development is too large for the scale of the neighborhood.

Mr. Sywald, Perforce Software owner, strongly favors integrating the street grid pattern in any future development, developing a site with lower dwelling unit density which is more in line with existing residential districts, and a higher residential density with mixed uses along the waterfront so there is activity in this area.

Ms. Gordon, Alameda Architectural Preservation Society member, discussed the letter submitted by Alameda Architectural Preservation Society and favors reusing the historic warehouses.

Mr. Buckley, Alameda Architectural Preservation Society member, discussed the letter submitted by the Alameda Architectural Preservation Society and favors extending Blanding into the proposed project and retaining the large, wood frame structures, which based on Woody Minors research, may be the only remaining structures from this era and of this type left in Alameda.

Mr. Krueger, resident, opposes the project because it lacks an extended street grid and it does not reflect the neighborhood fabric of the surrounding residential areas. Access to the residences should be through the front of dwelling units, from walkways, and there should be greater public access to the waterfront. He does not oppose the density, but favors an approach that spreads a variety of densities throughout the development.

Ms Decker, resident, favors a development that provides maximum pedestrian and waterfront access.

Mr. Woodard, resident, spoke in favor of an Estuary Park and low-rise buildings that do not to exceed two stories in height.

Mr. Gong, resident, cautioned that a thorough review of the City resources (police, school, utilities) should not be neglected, the result of which would have a negative impact on the proposed development. He recommended that the property owner include those that live in the neighborhood in the planning process for the development.

Mr. Bolten, resident, objects to the proposal. He added that the neighborhood's access to the waterfront is cut off, that three or four story buildings on this site would not be a good fit for the City and there would be negative parking impacts.

Mr. Sweeney, resident, noted he is in favor of the lower density alternative plan that was contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Report.

President Ezzy Ashcraft closed the public comment period.

Mr. Banta, architect for the property owner, spoke to the different options and stated that the lower density option may be the preferable alternative in order to address the neighborhood's concern. He requested that the Planning Board indicate if the lower density alternative would in fact be the favored alternative.

Vice-President Autorino stated that a site visit revealed the property appears to be in a deteriorated state and that it appears infeasible to reuse or rehabilitate many of the buildings on the site because they are in such a poor condition.

Board member Cook stated that she would favor some commercial activity along the waterfront in an effort to increase activity and use of the area.

Staff discussed the relative infeasibility of reusing the large buildings for commercial uses. He elaborated that the Historical Advisory Board would be asked to evaluate the EIR alternatives plus demolition of the structures and that a mixed use zoning designation could be applied to the property.

Board Member Kohlstrand cautioned that the alternatives should include a feasibility analysis so that only fiscally feasible alternatives are considered.

Board Member Zuppan supports the development of the park; however, she stated a concern that the City does not have the funding to pursue the development and maintenance of a park.

President Ezzy Ashcraft added she too supports the development of a park, and at a minimum would like to see the inclusion of children's' playgrounds included in the park space. But, she noted, as it was pointed out during staff's oral report, there are more opportunities for the development of parks in Alameda than there were at the time the General Plan was adopted.

Staff reiterated that the intent of the meeting was to discuss the adequacy of the Draft Environmental Impact Report and receive comments on the alternatives contained in the report.

Board member Cook noted she wants to see a grid pattern of streets in the development used and would like the width of these streets to be the same as those in the neighboring residential neighborhoods to promote their full integration into the community.

Board Member Kohlstrand strongly recommends a connected street grid and integrated feel into the existing neighborhood plus adequate pedestrian walkways and shared parking with Alameda Park Street Landing for the public park users. She is not in favor of retaining the warehouses for reuse, but supports developing interpretive vignettes that can be displayed, which will provide a link to the history of the site. She stated she believes the lower density alternative is superior to the proposed development plan and noted it holds a lot of promise and should be explored further.

Board Member Zuppan recommends adding an impact analysis to the Draft Environmental Impact Report in light of the Fruitvale bridge closure that is now under consideration. She also recommended an analysis of impacts on water usage and wastewater disposal, such as on-site gray water use. She asked whether the earthquake section of the Draft Environmental Impact Report adequately analyzes the development in light of recent earthquakes in other countries and data that has been gathered from the study of damage caused by these quakes. She also endorses the integration of the new development into the existing street grid. She recommended the inclusion of ancillary commercial uses to activate the public's enjoyment of the waterfront.

President Ezzy Ashcraft requested that Blanding Avenue, at the Oak Street intersection, receive a safe pedestrian crossing, should a revised plan continue this street through the development.

Following the conclusion of Board comments, President Ezzy Ashcraft ended this item and noted no action on the part of the Board was required and added this project would be brought back to the Board at future meetings, at which specific actions will be taken.

10. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS:

None.

11. BOARD COMMUNICATIONS:

None.

12. ADJOURNMENT:

**The meeting was adjourned at 9:40 p.m.**